

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are now pending in the application. Claims 21-30 have been added as new. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply comply with the Examiner's suggestions and to overcome the objections to the claims. The specification has been further amended to include description regarding the land portions clearly shown in the drawings. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The basis for the amendment and support for the new claims can be found throughout the application, claims and drawings as originally filed and as such no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p). The Examiner has stated that the drawings include reference characters 18, 20 and 22 which are not contained in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner as the reference numerals 18, 20 and 22 are clearly mentioned in the first sentence of paragraph 18 of the specification. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to remove this objection.

Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" Figures 2-5 have been amended to include numbering for the land regions (67, 69, 167, 169, 267, 269) of the plates.

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-5, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Applicant has further amended the specification to include greater detail regarding the land regions (67, 69, 167, 169, 267, 269). These features are clearly shown in the drawings as originally filed and were discussed in the specification as originally filed. As such no new matter has been presented.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Marianowski (U.S. Pat. No. 6,261,710, hereinafter "Marianowski"). Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Carlstrom (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2003/0224239, hereinafter "Carlstrom"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant encloses herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 and associated evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 stating that the present invention was at least conceived in this country prior to May 30, 2002, the filing date of Carlstrom, and thereafter that efforts were diligently made to reduce the invention to practice. Therefore, Carlstrom is not a valid prior art reference to the presently pending claims 1-6. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicant further notes that claim 1 has been amended to include a land region on the first sub-plate and a land region on the second sub-plate:

"one of said land region adjacent to said flow channel in said first sub-plate and said land region adjacent to said flow channel in said second

sub-plate having a width substantially greater than a width of said flow channel in the other of said first sub-plate and said second sub-plate.”

Marianowski does not appear to have or suggest land regions having a width greater than a width of a flow channel. In fact, Marianowski appears to show the opposite. If the portion of the plates joining adjacent flow channels in Marianowski was considered a land region it would have a width substantially less than the width of the flow channel. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended properly distinguishes from Marianowski.

Applicant notes that claims 2-6 and 21-30 depend from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1. In view of the above comments and the amendment to the independent claim, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 as amended.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 21-30 have been added to the application. Claims 21-30 include all of the limitations of claim 1, as well as some additional features. As such, claims 21-30 should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-14-05

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
Cary W. Brooks, Esq.
General Motors Corporation
Legal Staff - Mail Code 482-C23-B21
PO Box 300 - 300 Renaissance Center
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000
Ph: 313-665-4708
Fax: 313-665-4976

RWM/JMP